



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

m-f
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/006,618	12/10/2001	Akihiko Fujiwara	036741-0108	1127
22428	7590	11/01/2006	EXAMINER	
FOLEY AND LARDNER LLP				LETT, THOMAS J
SUITE 500				
3000 K STREET NW				
WASHINGTON, DC 20007				
				2625
				DATE MAILED: 11/01/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/006,618	FUJIWARA, AKIHIKO	
	Examiner Thomas J. Lett	Art Unit 2625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 July 2006.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) 15-18 is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 27 March 2002 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 24 July 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
2. Applicant argues Salgado et al do merely describes a technique for implementing a metaphorical job ticket/control system with a metaphorical template in a manual context and in an automatic context. Such a disclosure has nothing at all to do with the features recited in the claimed job schedule succeeding means, which succeeds a schedule from a first device (which has executed an input-related candidate job) to a second device (which will execute an output-related job hereafter). Examiner responds that the metaphorical job ticket contains (reads on synthesizes) both the input-related job (scanning of a document) as well as the output-related job (printing and/or emailing of the document).

Applicant further argues that the printed or emailed documents described in Salgado et al correspond to input-related candidate jobs that have already been executed, and do not correspond to an output-related candidate job that will be executed hereafter. Examiner responds that the input-related candidate job refers to a document that has yet to be scanned. That same document corresponds to an output-related candidate job (printing and/or emailing of the document) which is executed after the scanning of the document.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Salgado et al (USPN 5,872,569).

With respect to claim 1, as best understood by the Examiner, Salgado et al disclose a job executing system in which, with respect to a same processing object, designated jobs are executed in a sequence, comprising:

job management means (user interface 142, see Fig. 6, and see displays of Figs. 12 and 13 with controls) for managing an input-related candidate job (a scanned document at scanner 18 using scanner toolbar 304, col. 9, line 26) which executes chiefly input processing, and an output-related candidate job (printing document at printer 20 using toolbar 284, col. 9, line 26) which executes chiefly output processing; and

job synthesizing means (digital filing using storage device toolbar 306, col. 22, lines 9-14) for generating, according to a user's operation, a synthetic job constituted by an input-related candidate job which has been already executed by a first device (scanned documents by scanner 304), and an output-related candidate job which will be executed hereafter (printed or emailed documents, see Fig. 13); and

job schedule succeeding means (metaphorical template for workflow of a job ticket, col. 14, lines 10-21) for succeeding, only after the first device has executed the input-related candidate job, a schedule of the synthetic job generated from the first device (scanner 304) to a second device (printer 284 or email 286) when the second device which has yet to execute the output-related candidate job and the first device which has executed the input-related candidate job are different in the synthetic job (digital filing 306).

With respect to claim 2, Salgado et al disclose a job executing system according to claim 1, in which a graphical user interface environment is provided (user interface 142, see Fig. 6, and see displays of Figs. 12 and 13), wherein there is provided screen displaying means for displaying, on a screen, interactive figure elements (elements 280, 282, 284, 286, 304) each indicative of its associated candidate job; and

according to user's operations to some of the interactive figure elements, their associated candidate jobs are synthesized so as to obtain a synthetic job (element 306).

With respect to claim 3, Salgado et al disclose a job executing system according to claim 2, wherein

when the number of the input-related candidate jobs is two or more, the input-related candidate jobs are associated with their respective input means (several documents presented to scanner 304 would represent two or more associated with an input); and

when the number of the output-related candidate jobs is two or more, the output-related candidate jobs are associated with their respective output means (several

documents controlled to be emailed or printed would represent two or more associated with an output).

With respect to claim 4, Salgado et al disclose a job executing system according to claim 2, wherein there is provided standard setting information management means for accumulating and managing standard output setting information indicative of a standard attribute of the output-related candidate job (if an automatic implementation is desired, the process proceeds to step 224 (FIG. 10) where the user develops a template in which at least one initiating metaphor element and one device or storage metaphor are provided, col. 18, lines 57-61); and

according to a user's operation, the synthetic job thus obtained is executed while using the standard output setting information (if an automatic implementation is desired, the process proceeds to step 224 (FIG. 10) where the user develops a template in which at least one initiating metaphor element and one device or storage metaphor are provided, col. 18, lines 57-61).

With respect to claim 5, Salgado et al disclose a job executing system according to claim 3, in which, by means of user's operations to interactive figure elements, selection of an interactive figure element indicative of an input-related candidate job and selection of an interactive figure element indicative of an output-related candidate job are sequentially conducted to generate a synthetic job (if an automatic implementation is desired, the process proceeds to step 224 (FIG. 10) where the user develops a template in which at least one initiating metaphor element and one device or storage metaphor are provided, col. 18, lines 57-61), wherein there is provided synthesis

possibility judging means for judging, on the basis of a relationship between a characteristic of the input means thus associated and a characteristic of the output means thus associated, whether or not a synthesis can be conducted between an input-related or output-related job which has been already selected, and an output-related or input-related job which is intended to be selected by a user's operation (if an automatic implementation is desired, the process proceeds to step 224 (FIG. 10) where the user develops a template in which at least one initiating metaphor element and one device or storage metaphor are provided, col. 18, lines 57-61); and

when the synthesis possibility judging means judges that the synthesis cannot be conducted, a change is made to a display of the interactive figure element indicative of the output-related or input-related candidate job which is intended to be selected (in Fig. 11, processing the workflow involves querying and obtaining status information of devices in order to determine the ability to process jobs and the ability to substitute another device, col. 14, lines 19-21 and see Fig.11).

With respect to claim 6, Salgado et al disclose a job executing system according to claim 3, in which, by means of user's operations to interactive figure elements, selection of an interactive figure element indicative of an input-related candidate job and selection of an interactive figure element indicative of an output-related candidate job are sequentially conducted to generate a synthetic job, wherein there is provided a limitation content examining means for examining, on the basis of a relationship between a characteristic of the input means thus associated and a characteristic of the output means thus associated, a content of a limitation imposed when a synthesis is

conducted between an input-related or output-related candidate job which has been already selected, and an output-related or input-related candidate job which is intended to be selected by a user's operation (in Fig. 11, processing the workflow involves querying and obtaining status information of devices, and modifying attributes of jobs (S256,S258) in order to determine the ability to process jobs and the ability to substitute another device, col. 14, lines 19-21 and see Fig.11); and

according to an examination result made by the limitation content examining means, a change is made to a display of the interactive figure element indicative of the output-related or input-related candidate job which is intended to be selected (the ability to substitute another device in the device template, col. 14, lines 19-21 and see Fig.11).

With respect to claim 7, Salgado et al disclose a job executing system according to claim 3, in which, by means of user's operations to interactive figure elements, selection of an interactive figure element indicative of an input-related candidate job (a scanned document at scanner 18 using scanner toolbar 304, col. 9, line 26) and selection of an interactive figure element indicative of an output-related candidate job (printing document at printer 20 using toolbar 284, col. 9, line 26) are sequentially conducted to generate a synthetic job (the scanned file and email selection are associated with a digital filing job in Fig. 13), wherein based on an operating state of the output means, a change is made a display of the interactive figure element indicative of the output-related or input-related candidate job, which is intended to be selected by a user's operation (the ability to substitute another device in the device template, col. 14, lines 19-21 and see Fig.11).

With respect to claim 8, Salgado et al disclose a job executing method in which, with respect to a same processing object, designated jobs are executed in a sequence, comprising:

managing an input-related candidate job (document to be scanned) which executes chiefly input processing (a scanned document at scanner 18 using scanner toolbar 304, col. 9, line 26), and

an output-related candidate job (document to be printed) which executes chiefly output processing (printing document at printer 20 using toolbar 284, col. 9, line 26);

executing an input-related candidate job (document) by a first device (a scanned document at scanner 18 using scanner toolbar 304, col. 9, line 26);

generating, according to a user's operation, a synthetic job (document) constituted by the input-related candidate job which has been already executed by the first device, and an output-related candidate job which will be executed after the generating step; and

succeeding, only after the first device (scanner) has executed the input-related candidate job, a schedule of the synthetic job (document) generated from the first device to a second device when the second device (printer) which has yet to execute the output-related candidate job and the first device which has executed the input-related candidate job are different in the synthetic job.

Claim 9, a method, is rejected for the same reason as claim 2.

Claim 10, a method, is rejected for the same reason as claim 3.

Claim 11, a method, is rejected for the same reason as claim 4.

Claim 12, a method, is rejected for the same reason as claim 5.

Claim 13, a method, is rejected for the same reason as claim 6.

Claim 14, a method, is rejected for the same reason as claim 7.

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 15-18 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas J. Lett whose telephone number is (571) 272-7464. The examiner can normally be reached on 7-3:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David K. Moore can be reached on (571) 272-7437. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

TJL



KING Y. POON
PRIMARY EXAMINER